7/7/70

Dear Howard (Dick),

If you would be a real devil loving scripture, you must also see sermons not only in stones but in the words of the stoney. Fisher's letter to you is not negative but positive, and can be sued, effectively, in examination if we can get him on the stand and even in pre-trial interrogatories (there will be no funds for depositions, which would be the preferable form).

I think you may have more time for this than I now do, so why not carry your thought a bit further, and not restrict it to this single unwisdom.

As you inherently recognize, he disclosed himself a bit more (which encourages me to suggest that instead of breaking off you just hold off), for instead of saying the panel supports the medical findings of the Warren Report, which as quoted are not that at all, he says here, two things, not just the one you underscored. Both words are key, and especially in cross examination, where he can be asked to tick them off. Read this again, underscoring first each and them both: all and substantial.

Then why not list what could reasonable be cited as the "substantial" findings most subject to doubt. Examples better than that LHO and Ruby did nit know each other is that LHO fired all the shots. How could the panel know this? That all bullets, including the missed one, were full-jacketed, military. That LHO- or anyone else, could have fired that weapon that fast and that accurately. If you could do this, with citations, and then separately the medical findings, the real ones, if they can be called that (with the head wound never located in the Report, how could he confirm that, aside from the fact he disproves any version), also with R citations, this coukd be a valueable file to have in court. Which also means there is no rush on it. Another think that would help, though I have copies of some, if not most of your correspondence, would be a separate file of all of it with all the panel members, including the unanswered. I'd staple these in a file folder, the letters on one side and your commentary or an edited-down version on the other. Then, with one file, I could examine that aspect of his lordly eminence, covering that aspect without reference to anything else. And for this purpose, the cheaper Thermofaxes would do.

You call Fisher "our friend", intending the opposite. I suggest he is and will be more so, with luck and the proper skill, patiente and cool-holding.

You go into the Tippit killing, which is good, but that is part of what would better be a conjectural area, where the Commission just made its conclusions up. Now this one is one a many "substantial" ones that are without support, and how a forensic-medical expert could "support" such would at least be professionally embarrassing and at worst ruinous to him if before a decent judge. So, a separate one of these would be useful.

If and when you find occasion to write him again, make no further reference to "all substantial respects", for that would alert him and give him the chance with withdrew or modify it.

A separate file of everything on the shirt would be extremely useful. I am now drafting that complaint. Again, a separate commentary, if you think it should be done, where I can do the same thing.

Longbottom: I made a mistake. Please send to Gary Schoener, 1080 15th Avem SE, Minneapolis, Minn 55414...DJ clips helpful. Thanks.

PS no carbons

The copies of PM and PM III present a problem in diplomacy I didn't think of. The deal was that each of the others pay Paul for two, one of which would be given to me. It is not necessary for you to do that, so I'll provide them to you and handle it specially with Paul by sending him that money and asking him to make a copy when he has occasion to have another made.

While I do not think any of the others would resent a special consideration to a junior, why raise the question?

Soon as I can I'll see if I haven't such a set. I think I do. If so, I'll mail it soon. If not, I'll let you know and make arrangements.

Returning to the "substantial", there is the magic bullet with the built-in intelligence, etc. Here I have gone into it at sufficient length in preparation for the spectro case. I cite is as a case where you might want to just note some reminders for one cannot keep all in mind and I'd do best to have a list. If I can pull this in court, straight and with a great expert on the stand, what a marvellous lampoon of the WR it would be!